

By Mr. TELLER:
H. Con. Res. 143. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLF:
H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution providing for the development through the United Nations of international educational programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:
H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution providing for an investigation of mental health programs which are being promoted; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORGAN:
H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution calling for a convention of delegates from the NATO countries to explore methods of achieving more effective and democratic unity in advancing their common interest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. Res. 247. Resolution to authorize printing additional copies of House Document 57 (86th Cong.); to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to take steps to acquire, establish, and develop a Kettle Moraine National Park in Wisconsin to properly commemorate the glacial age; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to World War I veterans' pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a sliding scale tariff on lead imports for the purpose of combating excessive foreign imports on the market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to safeguard and preserve established State and individual rights to the use of water within the separate States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make provision now for the inclusion of the convertible features during the initial construction of the new atomic reactor at Hanford; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:
H.R. 6542. A bill for the relief of Tomislav Mrvica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:
H.R. 6543. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:
H.R. 6544. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yen Fue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6545. A bill for the relief of George Vargha (known as George Gracza) and his wife Joyce Mary Vargha (known as Joyce Mary Gracza); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRWAN:
H.R. 6546. A bill for the relief of Nancy Mae Floor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:
H.R. 6547. A bill for the relief of Manuel Cardoso, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:
H.R. 6548. A bill for the relief of John S. Cardoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:
H.R. 6549. A bill for the relief of Dominador D. Galdo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

158. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 485 citizens of Waterloo, Iowa, urging that the burden of Government expenditures be reduced to the lowest practicable level and that a program of tax reform be instituted which would result, over a reasonable period of time and on an orderly basis, in a tax-rate structure—particularly in regard to the Federal income tax—which would be moderate at all levels and permit the maximum development of the Nation's economic potential. Petitions are herewith submitted by James Fox, president of the Waterloo Junior Chamber of Commerce, in connection with the organization's project tax reform; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

159. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the clerk, Orange County Board of Supervisors, Goshen, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting suspension of the operation of the so-called Byrd amendment to the Federal road program; to the Committee on Public Works.

160. Also, petition of Edmond P. Egan, Schenectady, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance against the Department of Justice, Secretary of the Navy, Civil Service Commission, and the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Questions Dictator Castro Did Not Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions not answered by Fidel Castro:

First. You said that in case of war between the United States and Communist Russia, Cuba should remain neutral. Do you not think that such an attitude would work in Russia's favor?

Second. The Communist newspaper, Hoy, is now being printed in Havana on presses that you confiscated from their legal owners. Is your Government leasing these presses to the Communists, or did you sell them outright, or did you maybe give them to them?

Third. Former President Figuera, of Costa Rica, said in a speech in Cuba, that in the event of war, Latin American countries should support the United States. Why did you disagree publicly with Figuera on this point?

Fourth. People of the United States have always been friendly toward Cuba.

The U.S. Government made absolutely no effort to intervene in your revolution. Why did you say you were ready to kill 200,000 gringos if the United States stepped in to protect American lives and property they own in Cuba?

Fifth. You have said publicly that news agencies, newspapers, and magazines have lied about you and your Government publicly. Would you be specific just who lied?

Sixth. Is it true that unemployment has increased to an alarming degree since you took over the Government in Cuba? Unemployment in private enterprise as well as government agency unemployment?

Seventh. By the way, why did you recently suspend 2,500 schoolteachers?

Eighth. When you attacked army barracks in Santa Ana and were captured and then sentenced to 15 years in prison, Batista, then the head of the Cuban Government, let you out in about a year and a half. Since you have become President of Cuba, why do you not follow the same policies? Or do you find it easier to shoot your prisoners? Is it probably cheaper?

Ninth. You have been looked upon as a fighter in favor of a democracy, and antidictatorship man. Why then do you give orders to your courts, and even ask reversals of decisions from "not guilty"

to the "death sentence"? Is that democratic?

Tenth. In the famous trial of the 43 Air Force pilots which took place in Santiago, is it true that they were acquitted and that you showed your disapproval, and that therefore the attorneys were expelled from the courtroom and detained? Among them a lawyer who once defended you?

Is it not a fact that as a result of your orders, a new tribunal was formed under the supervision of your brother, Raul, and that he took the position of the district attorney, as well as the defense minister, and that he then accused his lawyers of being Batista sympathizers?

Eleventh. Is it not also true that these acquitted persons were tried all over again and the majority of them sentenced to 30 years at hard labor?

Twelfth. During the dictatorship which you fought against, the embassies in Havana had no trouble whatsoever in getting out of the country, those persons who took refuge in them? Why is there such a great contrast between what went on under Batista and what goes on today, regarding the right of refuge and asylum?

Thirteenth. You have said that the executions in Cuba would not exceed more than 400—yet there are well over 500 already, and 5,000 are still awaiting trial? Do you think such blood baths,

and such purges are becoming to a democratic government that professes love for humanity?

Fourteenth. Is it not true that your mother, Mrs. Lina Ruz Castro—your own mother—has said that during the Batista government she not only had personal guaranty of safety, but that her home and family properties were also protected? Would this policy not be better than the one your government presently engages in?

Verrazzano Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 435 years ago, on April 17, 1524, the first white man entered New York Bay and discovered Manhattan Island.

This man was the great Italian navigator and explorer, Giovanni da Verrazzano; a man whose name should rank with those of Columbus, Vespucci, and Magellan, but who instead, has been largely forgotten and ignored. He is rarely, if ever, mentioned in the textbooks and his history is only known to a few scholars. Yet, the fact remains that, 85 years before Henry Hudson and 96 years before the *Mayflower* pilgrims, Verrazzano had come to these shores, explored them carefully, and told Europe about them.

Giovanni da Verrazzano was born near Florence about 1485. His family was engaged in the trading of spices, silk, and other precious commodities from the Orient. Quite early in life Giovanni acquired his geographical and nautical knowledge in Egypt and Syria. He made his first trip to the New World in 1508 at the age of 23. Some years later he attracted the attention of the King of France who decided to send Verrazzano to discover a northwest passage to Asia. In January 1524, therefore, the navigator set sail on the 100-ton, 3-masted *Dauphine*. More than 3 months later he landed on the coast of North Carolina and named the new continent *Francesca*, after the King. He then proceeded northward as far as Newfoundland. En route the *Dauphine* anchored in New York Bay and was greeted by a group of surprised Indians whom Verrazzano described as agreeable, friendly, and pleasant. Unfortunately, the stay was cut short by an unfavorable wind, but not before New York was given its first name of Angoulême. A few years after this historic expedition Verrazzano, while exploring new lands, was captured by the natives and killed.

The contributions of Verrazzano to American history are many. He was the first man to chart and name the harbors, bays, capes, and islands that he discovered, thus opening the path to other voyagers who have come to these shores in ever-growing numbers since

then. The principal merit of this great Italian, however, stems from the fact that he was the first European to sail to our shores with the express purpose of exploring them. His voyage has been called one of the most scientific and purposeful of all those made in the 16th century and his report of the voyage one of the most accurate of those written at that time.

Thus Verrazzano Day should serve to keep awake the appreciation and knowledge of our great historical heritage and as a reminder of the cultural relations between the Old and New Worlds that had their beginnings with the famous Florentine explorer, Giovanni da Verrazzano. It should also serve as just one more reminder of the great contributions made by the Italians to these United States.

From Verrazzano and Columbus down through the ages to La Guardia and Fermi the Italians have left their mark on American history and culture.

Dr. Warren Tracy and Coe College Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, as the National Library Week draws to a close, I would like to salute the Stewart Memorial Library, which is a part of Coe College, one of the truly fine liberal arts colleges in my district.

The library, a gift of the late Col. Robert W. Stewart, has recently undergone a facility expansion and physical improvement program. The program, which amounted to \$37,763, includes a new lighting system, new stacks and study areas, and new draperies. Other improvements for the library include a microfilm and microcard reader and a verifax photo copier.

This fine progress in the Coe College Library can be attributed to the untiring work of Dr. Warren Tracy, and his fine staff. The staff includes Mrs. Warren Tracy, reference librarian; Mrs. Fred C. Fisher, Jr., and Mrs. Freda Chambers, circulation librarians; Mrs. Donald Stonemen, cataloger, and part-time student workers.

Dr. Tracy, who is now in his fifth year as head librarian, has done a remarkable job of rebuilding the library. With a few grants, and many long hours of work by Dr. Tracy, the library collection now includes 65,000 volumes and 280 periodicals—some dating before the 1900's. Under his leadership exhibits of wider cultural and artistic scope are going to be sponsored by the library similar to the current one; the Gertrude Stein exhibit.

It must be remembered that the universities with their large libraries are not fully responsible for the cultural growth of a city. But rather it is the small liberal arts college libraries, with their

small staffs, that have taken the cultural lead in the cities. These staffs, such as the one Dr. Tracy heads, have made the growth of their libraries a very personal one in which the entire city has benefited.

It is indeed an honor to give particular recognition to Dr. Warren Tracy and Coe College for their fine contribution to the liberal arts college library and to their city of Cedar Rapids.

Toll Charges for the St. Lawrence Seaway Are Grossly Inadequate and Once Again the American Taxpayer Is Headed for Another Multi-Million-Dollar Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, recently, it was announced that the United States and Canada had formally set the tolls which ships will be charged to use the St. Lawrence Seaway when it opens late in April. The tolls as announced for moving the length of the entire Seaway from Montreal to Lake Erie will be 6 cents on each ton of a ship's official weight plus 42 cents for each ton of bulk cargo or 95 cents a ton on general cargo.

In my opinion, these tolls will prove to be grossly inadequate and once again the poor taxpayer will be taken for another multi-million-dollar ride. The public who today pays for practically all of the costs of maintaining our entire system of inland waterways, is probably getting used to paying and paying for facilities which benefit only a handful. But that doesn't make it right.

It is inconceivable how the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the American principal in drafting the tolls, can accomplish with the announced tolls the mandate of the Congress which is self-liquidation within 50 years of the \$128 million cost. It is going to be utterly impossible to follow this mandate with inadequate toll charges which are based on highly speculative volumes and an estimate of prospective traffic volume which exceeds the practical capacity of the facilities soon to be opened.

In addition to the provisions of law regarding self-liquidation through toll revenues, there were important economic considerations which Congress must have certainly recognized when it was decided that tolls would be charged. One of the most important of these considerations was the Seaway's effect on the overall costs and adequacy of the Nation's transportation system. Unless the Seaway is fully self-supporting, with no element of subsidy to the users, it cannot possibly contribute to the true economy of the whole transportation picture. In a competitive transportation situation, inadequate tolls are going to

create uneconomic transportation patterns by shifting traffic from less costly methods to the more costly, subsidized method.

These inadequate toll charges which will not cover full costs place the railroads on a standby basis. This consequence will be all the more serious and disruptive because the Seaway is only a part-time transportation facility, whereas the Nation for its commerce and defense requires dependable transportation services in both summer and winter. The Nation's transportation requirements for defense obviously do not cease with the close of the navigation season, nor does its commerce hibernate.

Subsidizing the Seaway, through inadequate tolls, further aggravate these factors of instability, with seasonal disturbances of employment. This is in direct conflict with existing aims of national policy to encourage stability of employment conditions in the United States and in its several industries, including the railroads.

To arrive at the charges just announced, the Seaway Corporation, in estimating the annual tonnage that the Seaway could handle, is as far off first base as were the cost estimates presented in 1954 to the Congress to gain approval of the project. The cost estimates have now proven to be unrealistic and it is just a matter of time before there will be two outs. The official estimate of the annual capacity of the Seaway has been for some time 50 million tons—and now a Seaway official has said that it may reach 75 million tons. All I can say about both of these estimates is: fantastic. And I will tell you why.

The main purpose in deepening the St. Lawrence was to encourage oceangoing vessels having a draft of 27 feet or less to serve inland ports on the Great Lakes. In order to reach those ports, these ships must pass through the only connecting link between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, the Welland Canal.

The capacity of the Welland Canal has generally been recognized as the critical limiting factor governing the volume of traffic that can move through the Seaway. It is amazing to me why the U.S. Tolls Committee in its report of last June said nothing about this very vital matter although a press release accompanying the report mentioned a maximum tonnage of cargo of 60 million tons at Welland. There was absolutely no explanation of how the figure, which of course is totally unrealistic, was picked out of thin air.

The records show that the peak traffic volume through the Welland Canal was 23 million tons in 1956. While I realize that the deepening of the canal and the Seaway to allow passage of ships having drafts up to 27 feet will mean that ships with greater tonnage capacity will use the facilities, it is utterly ridiculous to assume that the tonnage capacity at Welland will ever within the foreseeable future reach 60 million tons a year. This, believe it or not, is more than 2½ times the traffic which has ever passed through the canal in 1 year.

Gentlemen, you must understand that the agreed-upon tolls were set using this

fantastic tonnage capacity as a starting point and I am sure you are wondering how the Government is ever going to recoup its investment. You can stop wondering because there is not one chance in a thousand that it will.

How am I going to tell my friends back in Altoona, Pa., where the only water we have is Brush Run, which is deep enough for canoes after the rainy season, that they are going to help pay for the deficit which the Government faces because of inadequate tolls for the Seaway? They already know they are helping to contribute close to \$40 million each year just to maintain navigation on our inland waterways system and many more millions to improve it. Soon they will be asked to help defray the costs of the Seaway.

And what about the Great Lakes, the nearest of which is almost 200 miles from my district. In a recent statement, commenting on the fact that the imposition of any tolls on the Seaway constituted a distinct threat to the economic well-being of the Great Lakes area, Adm. Lyndon Spencer, president of the Lake Carriers' Association, said:

The Great Lakes are a natural highway for moving grain from western growing centers to eastern consuming centers.

Certainly the Great Lakes are a natural highway that no ships could use unless harbors were deepened, locks maintained, and channels dredged. Do you know how much the Government has spent to date on this natural highway—more than \$500 million of your money and mine.

Many people have said that the recession caused most of the unemployment in the railroad industry that exists today. Perhaps it caused some layoffs, but to me a principal cause has and will continue to be the Government's subsidizing the water carriers. This must be curtailed.

But let us get back to the Welland Canal and its capacity. I wonder if the Development Corporation when it suggested the tolls which are supposed to cover the costs of the Seaway understood what the workable capacity of Welland meant. Certainly much more is involved than figuring the maximum number of lockages that can be performed per day and multiplying by the number of days in the navigation season to obtain a total of physical capacity in lockages. If they made this kind of mathematical caper, we are in for trouble.

In determining tonnage capacity, allowances should have been made for interruptions because of adverse weather and accidents. More important still is the fact that the traffic will not flow with uniform regularity all hours of the day, in all days of the peak month, in all months of the navigation season, or from one navigation season to another. These variations of traffic have a pronounced downward effect upon the practical capacity of the canal and should have been used as a basis in formulating toll levels to cover costs.

Available data clearly show that traffic at Welland is not evenly spaced throughout the navigation season, but starts off slowly, rises to a summer peak, and tapers off with the approach of cold

weather. Therefore, any calculation of Welland's capacity that treats every day or month of the navigation season as equivalent is certain to involve substantial error and cannot represent the effective capacity.

So it is also with respect to year-to-year variations in traffic resulting from fluctuations in the general economy. This simply means that the top capacity of Welland, whatever it may be, will not be used every year, owing to business fluctuations affecting such major commodities as ore, grain, coal, as well as others. On the average, over a period of years, it is unlikely for this reason that the full annual capacity of Welland would be used to a greater extent than 90 percent, since the capacity cannot be exceeded but utilization will frequently fall below it. Over the 10 years from 1948 through 1957, for example, the volume of bulk freight on the Great Lakes ranged from a high of 200 million tons in 1953 to a low of 151 million tons in 1954. A realistic determination of toll levels should have taken these cyclical fluctuations into account.

Summing up all of these pertinent considerations, and giving them a realistic evaluation, points out clearly that the effective capacity of Welland cannot exceed 40 million tons and will be less than that year in and year out. This would allow for a maximum of 7,200 transits, with more large vessels than have used the canal up to now and fewer possibilities than in the past for multiple transits. It also allows for greater average cargo tonnage per vessel transited, but there appears to be no reason to assume that the average cargo tons per transit will exceed 5,500 tons at any time in the foreseeable future, which is more than twice as great as the average in recent years. There will be very probably some larger vessels, but there will also continue to be many small ones and empty ones to keep the average size of the vessels from soaring as the unrestrained optimists have led us to believe.

I am sure that if you agree with my analysis of the cargo tonnage capacity of Welland, which I think is very realistic, it goes without saying that the 40 million ton figure provides the top limit of tonnage that should have been taken as a basis for determining appropriate tolls for the St. Lawrence Seaway and for Welland.

Unfortunately for the taxpayer, the Tolls Committee in recognition of the functional relationship between the St. Lawrence and the Welland Canal has set the maximum seaway traffic at 50 million tons compared with 60 million tons for Welland. The difference of 10 million tons is principally accounted for by interlake traffic which does not use the St. Lawrence River. Very probably this interlake traffic will expand and further reduce the remaining seaway traffic potential as affected by Welland.

Since my analysis shows that the Tolls Committee has overestimated the Welland capacity by at least 20 million tons, it has likewise overestimated the available traffic potential of the Seaway in the St. Lawrence by at least the same amount. Hence, the maximum traffic for

the Seaway will be no more than 30 million tons instead of 50 million tons. This means that the Seaway revenues as calculated by the Tolls Committee on the basis of the agreed upon tolls will suffice to cover only 60 percent of the Seaway costs, thus falling far short of the requirements of law with respect to self-liquidation.

It is indeed unfortunate that those responsible for setting the tolls did not fully take into account a realistic tonnage capacity for Welland. If they had it would have been clear that considerably higher tolls were necessary to effect self-liquidation within the required period. I am sure the higher tolls would not have discouraged ships from using the Seaway because traffic that will become firmly attached to this route as the most advantageous means of transportation can afford to pay full-cost tolls. I can see no need to offer a bargain variety of tolls for traffic which can be realistically expected to develop for the Seaway on an economic basis. And yet, this is what has been done as the Seaway prepares to open for its navigation season.

Although the law states that a review of the situation must be made before July 1, 1964, this is much too long to wait if we are ever going to rectify the mistakes that have already been made. I therefore strongly urge that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation should insist that, after the close of the navigation season in 1960, a review of the toll charges be made to determine how much the tolls should be raised. After two full seasons, sufficient statistics should have been developed which will show whether we are collecting enough to cover our costs. I am sure these figures when they are made public, will show the absolute necessity for making an upward readjustment of tolls for the Seaway and the canal.

Social Security Makes Nickel-Shooter of Ponzi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks I submit the following broadcast I made over the Manion Forum Network on Sunday evening, April 12, 1959, when discussing the inequities and faults of our present old age security insurance system. I do so principally for the enlightenment and edification of the many new Members of Congress.

SOCIAL SECURITY MAKES NICKEL-SHOOTER OF PONZI

Dean MANION. I think it was Mark Twain who first said that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it. With our social security system, it is just the opposite. Everybody pays for it, but practically nobody talks about it.

The clever Washington bureaucrats who manage the involved, inexplicable mishmash, known as the Federal social security system, have made it into a political sacred cow. No matter where it roams, what it does, or how precariously it teeters on the brink of bankruptcy, no politician who equates his own chances for reelection with the public interest will dare to remonstrate.

In the handbook of practical politics, it says that all the ambitious Congressman is supposed to do about social security is to raise the benefits and spread the coverage. If he should happen to question the obvious vandalism of thus burning the taxpayer's candle at both ends, he will be deluged with vituperation as a calloused enemy of our needy old people.

Fortunately, there are a few Congressmen in Washington who do not quail before the menacing public relations octopus of the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and who thus dare to tell the awful truth about our present social security system.

I have one of these courageous Congressmen with me at this microphone now. Representative NOAH MORGAN MASON, of Illinois, has been a Member of Congress for 20 years. His firmly established reputation for honest, enlightened statesmanship enabled him to throw away the political handbook years ago. I am sure you will agree that his candor is refreshing and that his logic is irrefutable.

Here is my greatly respected friend, Congressman MASON.

Congressman MASON. Thank you, Dean Manion, for those kind words of introduction. I am both honored and delighted to be given this opportunity to speak to your Sunday evening radio audience on the subject of social security. It is a difficult subject to understand or to explain.

Our present social security setup is unsound, inequitable and dishonest. The Brookings Institution, one of the best research organizations in the United States today, after a careful and exhaustive study, recommended that our social security setup be scrapped, abandoned, and that a pay-as-you-go social security program be established in its place.

I agree with that recommendation. If it were adopted and carried out, it would mean, as the Brookings Institution expresses it: "Our generation would care for its own old people and trust future generations to do likewise."

In 1950, after 3½ months of exhaustive hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, I was one of the three members of that committee who voted "no" on a bill that proposed to expand the coverage of social security and to increase the benefits. I was also 1 of 14 House Members to vote "no" on the final passage of that bill in the House.

Since then, I have opposed every attempt to expand our social security program, to increase its benefits, or to increase the social security tax rates. Yet, I am heartily in favor of a sound, liberal social security program to take care of our needy old people.

UN SOUND, DISHONEST, INEQUITABLE

The overwhelming weight of the evidence gathered during the 3½ months of public hearings in 1950 was to the effect that our present social security setup was unsound, dishonest, and inequitable, that it was "a Ponzi-type shell game," sold to the American people, by F.D.R. and his New Deal associates, as a plan to provide security in their old age.

It is an insurance program which if practiced by any insurance company today would land every director and every official of that company in the penitentiary for misuse or misappropriation of trust funds.

The present social security program is characterized in a report of the Brookings

Institution as a plan whereby "we (the present generation) do the promising; you (all future generations) do the paying." That is an accurate picture of our present social security program.

The following social security facts bear out these contentions; they cannot be ignored:

First. When the social security law was adopted in 1934, it provided that all money collected in social security taxes should be dumped into the Federal Treasury and that such cash could be used for the general expenditures of the Government, placing Government I O U's or bonds into the social security fund in lieu of the cash as a book-keeping arrangement. That provision is still in the law.

Second. Under the law, some \$50 billion has been collected in social security taxes, but less than half that amount has been paid out in benefits. The balance—all spent for the general expenditures of the Government—is a debt that has been placed upon the backs of future generations.

Taxing American workers to get money to pay social security benefits to the workers upon retirement, then spending half the money collected for other purposes is neither fair nor equitable.

Third. Our social security program, since its inception, has been used for political purposes by both parties. In election years, benefits have been increased to attract votes for the party in power, thereby making the social security fund actuarially unsound.

Then, in the off-election year, the social security tax rates have been increased to try to get the fund back on an actuarially sound basis. (If that is not playing politics with the welfare of our retired old people, I do not know what is.)

Fourth. The original purpose of the social security program was to establish a floor of security under the low-income worker for support in his old age. He was then expected to build upon that floor added security by buying insurance, by establishing a savings account, or by making investments with his extra cash.

To make this possible, a tax was levied only upon the first \$2,000 of the worker's income. Today, we levy a tax upon the first \$4,800 of the worker's income, leaving little if any cash for the taxpayer to invest for himself.

We have entirely forgotten the original purpose of social security. Today, Uncle Sam acts as though the worker is not capable of spending his own money wisely, for security in his old age; therefore, the Government must do it for him.

SHOULD BE ON PAY-AS-YOU-GO BASIS

These facts—and they are facts—added to the evidence given in the public hearings in 1950, convince me that we should, without further delay, adopt the social security recommendations of the Brookings Institution and place the social security program upon a cash basis—a pay-as-you-go basis.

If we did that, it would eliminate the present yearly \$500 million interest charge upon our fictitious social security fund—which will soon become a \$1 billion interest charge.

It also would do away with all need for reserves, all need for level premiums, all need for costly and elaborate bookkeeping systems, all need for the present heavy administrative costs of social security, and it would make possible the payment of more liberal social security benefits to our retired old people in the lower income brackets. That in itself would be well worthwhile.

To demonstrate how unsound and dishonest our present social security program is, I offer the following hypothetical case:

John Smith decides to establish his own social security program, so he deducts a certain percent of each pay check he receives

and places the cash regularly in his safe deposit box. After doing this for several years and having thus set aside, say, \$5,000, to insure security in his old age, John Smith starts to spend each month more than he earns—as Uncle Sam does now.

Then, John Smith hits upon the plan of taking a certain amount of cash out of his lockbox each month to spend, placing in the box, in lieu of the cash extracted, promissory notes to himself. If John Smith keeps this up, when he retires he will have only promissory notes to himself to live on—which he has no way of changing into cash for groceries.

That is exactly what Uncle Sam is doing with the social security tax receipts—the only difference being that Uncle Sam has the general taxing power to invoke in order to change his I O U's into cash to meet his future social security obligations.

But, that means of course new taxes, additional taxes, to meet obligations that are supposed to have been paid for already by the beneficiaries.

I wonder if that scheme of taxing the children and grandchildren of the social security beneficiary for something he and his employer are supposed to have paid for can be called anything but dishonest and immoral, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age.

For years I have been working in Congress, not to abolish social security, as some people would have you believe, but rather to place our social security program upon a sound basis, a cash basis, a pay-as-you-go basis, collecting each year just the amount of social security taxes needed to pay the benefits due that year for the support of our retired old people.

In that way—paraphrasing the words of the Brookings Institution report—we (the present generation) would take care of our own old people, and you (all future generations) would be expected to do likewise. To my mind, that would be the sensible thing to do in connection with our social security problem.

Dean MANION. Thank you, Congressman NOAH MASON. Now, my friends, do you see any reason why the irrefutable truth that Congressman MASON has just spoken should not be brought to the millions who are now being ruthlessly taxed under the false pretense that they are thus providing for their old age?

We must take care of our needy old people and that is the very reason why the present so-called social security system, which is merely taxation with misrepresentation, should be changed for something that will do the necessary job.

Send Congressman MASON's speech to your Congressman. Ask him to give you his frank opinion on the merits of what Congressman MASON has suggested.

Lewis L. Strauss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most honorable gentlemen, courageous and patriotic men, able and dedicated public servants it has been my privilege to know is Lewis L. Strauss. He is gentle; he is kind; he is humble; he possesses the quality of greatness that in our history such rare men as he have

given as a heritage to the Nation. At the moment he is enduring a prolonged and difficult personal trial. It is good that those who know, admire, and respect him speak words of encouragement at this time.

Anniversary of Lincoln's West Virginia Statehood Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, today is an important date in the history of my home State of West Virginia. On this date 96 years ago, the Great Emancipator, President Abraham Lincoln, signed the proclamation that designated West Virginia a new State.

The actual admission of West Virginia into the Union came 60 days later, on June 20, 1863, under the terms of President Lincoln's proclamation. This latter date is celebrated as West Virginia Day in our State, but the confirmation of its entry into the Union occurred on April 20.

President Lincoln, sorely beset by the crushing burden of wartime leadership, probably had little time to reflect on the consequences and importance of his action. But there is little doubt that the formation of this new State was widely acclaimed. The courageous stand against slavery—and particularly against being drawn into war with the indissoluble Union—which the hardy and independent mountain folk had taken was thus rewarded with status as a free and equal State, and deservedly so.

It is an oversimplification, however, to say that the western counties broke away from the mother State over the issue of slavery alone. This was a contributing factor, but not the only one by any means.

There had long been sentiment for the creation of a separate State west of the crest of the Appalachians.

Geographically, the mountaineers who settled the slopes and valleys of West Virginia were much closer to their neighbors in the Ohio Valley than to other sections.

By sentiment, too, the western Virginian belonged with his hardy counterparts in Kentucky and Ohio. The mountaineer, struggling to forge a better life for his family amid the towering, forbidding mountains, felt that the voice of the mountain dweller—then as today—was not always heard.

Thus, we can see that in many respects—in fact, in almost all respects—the stage was set for West Virginia statehood long before the slave issue set the Nation aflame. There had been repeated efforts to form a separate State long before the war triggered the final break.

West Virginia has come a long way since then. Vast deposits of untold mineral wealth have poured from her

mountains, particularly in the unbelievably rich coalfields to the south. Chemical, glass and steel manufacturers have chosen the many resources of the State in the manufacture of their products. Her forests are still undepleted, although millions of feet of timber have been taken from her majestic hills.

This growth might have been slowed, might possibly never have attained its present stature at all, had not President Lincoln determined to permit this economic entity to become a separate State 96 years ago today.

Today, the State of West Virginia already is making forward-looking plans for its centennial, 4 years hence in 1963. Already, elaborate preparations are being made to pay fitting tribute to a great State entering its second century. Realistic and thoughtful planning is being done in regard to West Virginia's future, in an attempt to assure that the second century will be even greater in achievement than the first.

It is only fitting that we pause, as these many preparations gain momentum, to pay tribute to the great American who affixed his signature to the document that proclaimed West Virginia's birth, during the year that marks the 150th anniversary of his birth.

Under unanimous consent I at this point insert the text of Abraham Lincoln's proclamation of April 20, 1863:

PROCLAMATION ADMITTING WEST VIRGINIA INTO THE UNION, APRIL 20, 1863, BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas by the act of Congress approved the 31st day of December last, the State of West Virginia was declared to be one of the United States of America, and was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever, upon the condition that certain changes should be duly made in the proposed constitution for that State; and

Whereas proof of a compliance with that condition, as required by the second section of the act aforesaid, has been submitted to me:

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States, do hereby, in pursuance of the act of Congress aforesaid, declare and proclaim that the said act shall take effect and be in force from and after 60 days from the date hereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this 20th day of April, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-three, and of the independence of the United States the 87th.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

By the President:

WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State.

District Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his famous Cataline oration, that great

Roman statesman, Cicero, spoke seven words which legions of schoolboys over the intervening centuries have committed to memory. These words are:

Quo usque tandem abutere, Catalina, patientia nostra.

How long, oh Catalina, will you abuse our patience?

The sense of frustration which Cicero expressed in the Roman Senate is one that we experience from time to time in this modern forum of representative government.

It is one that aptly describes my personal sentiments when I contemplate the situation of home-rule legislation in this body today. After years of study and despite the broad support for this bill, we have, at this hour, gotten exactly nowhere in obtaining consideration of the bill by the District Committee.

It is not as if this legislation were new or revolutionary. This home-rule bill has passed the Senate four times in the last five Congresses. It is presently being heard by the Senate District Committee.

It is not that there is no interest in the bill. Twenty-three Members of this House, of both parties, have introduced the legislation.

It is not that the bill has no urgency attached to it. The president of the District Commissioners has characterized it as the most important piece of legislation affecting the District before the Congress.

Nor can one say that there is little sentiment in favor of home rule in the District itself. In the District Democratic primary of 1956, nearly 80 percent of the voters expressed their support. Similarly, in a recent Republican mail poll, two-thirds were for it.

No, it is not lack of support, lack of interest or lack of importance that have stalled action. It is because there is wide support and interest—because the majority of the Members of this House are anxious to vote in favor of home-rule legislation—that the legislative process has been obstructed. Such obstructionism abuses our patience. How long will it last?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 18, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, April 18, 1959)

Cherry blossoms amid balmy weather, snow, and bright 80-degree sunshine, in that order, make a strange week—but that's spring in Washington. Visitors are everywhere, enjoying sightseeing. Republican women from Dallas, Tex., and the Nation are here, holding their annual conference. It's a

compliment to Congressmen to have visitors from home who will take the time to observe the legislative process. A Congressman's job would be better understood if constituents could see the committee work, where hearings are held and legislation fashioned. Then, the floor work in the House, and finally the endless office routine of correspondence over the problems of constituents. Frequently, all activities are simultaneous.

The Federal Government has grown so large in recent years it is now likely that legislation suffers from a lack of study by the Congressmen, who are besieged with countless other duties. Worse yet, this fact will go unrecognized so that Government getting out of hand will not be blamed on the right cause, namely, too little time to do too many things. Other charges will be made, and more legislation devised to correct legislation. Meanwhile, the water is muddied further by political parties that choose up sides with too hasty study of the facts. Only as a result of careful study of alternatives can the successful solutions to today's problems be found. Often, the obvious is most difficult to see. (Item: A Member sent a package of sightsavers made in his district to each Congressman saying, "We are entering that period of the session when budget figures will be flying fast and furiously. I trust these will assist you in seeing the figures more clearly.")

The military construction bill totaled \$1,251 million for defense construction, \$131 million of which is outside the United States and \$548 million approximately is classified (secret). The bill includes such items as operational and training facilities, maintenance, research and development and test, hospital and medical facilities, housing, utilities and real estate. Texas' part is \$28 million, including \$348,000 for Dallas' Naval Air Station and \$64,000 for the Army Reserve Center.

The military is big business in this Nation, even in this relatively small construction end. In fact, defense expenditures are so great and so integral a part of this Nation's economy, I wonder what would happen if Russia actually wanted peace, and we were suddenly faced with disarmament and demilitarizing. Could a nation of free people and business rooted in free enterprise survive competitively, as compared to the regimented societies of totalitarian states where people can be ordered about? Here's one to think about.

The Bob Taft Memorial Carillon Tower symbolizes the side of America that everyone can cherish and in remembering try to emulate, thanking God for the opportunity and freedom to do so. At the dedication these qualities came to the forefront, and refreshingly, without apology. Bob Taft laid down principles and then followed them, even when odds were great, when pressures against him were almost unbearable. Ambition and power were sacrificed when he relinquished seniority privileges to join another committee to write a labor law, which he reasoned then was the Nation's great need. Conscience was his guide, not political popularity. And when it came time to die, knowing this in advance, he met this without missing a stride. As he told Herbert Hoover, who urged him to go to the hospital, "My friend, you know what is the matter with me. I am going to die with my boots on." Here's American manhood at its best. As Mr. Hoover said, "In the belfry of this monument there is a magnificent carillon. When these great bells ring out, it will be a summons to integrity and courage." Congressmen should hear and heed these bells. Bob Taft's memory will help all Americans.

Our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, was resoundingly praised in the House when his retirement from office was announced. I wondered why he couldn't have received some of this praise earlier when in-

stead his critics were denouncing him, chiefly for his unyielding firmness toward Russia. Like Taft, he may be appreciated more in the future, when those who counseled him to give in to Russia are long forgotten.

Why are so many of our greatest and strongest men removed from the scene when they are so badly needed? Lincoln, Taft, Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall, to name only three of the many. An even heavier load is distributed among those who remain. In this world we have a big job to do for ourselves, our children, and future generations. To this task we had better dedicate ourselves.

Remembering Taft's beliefs in the role of Federal Government would be so helpful today. For example: "This was the way America was built up. The only way to resume progress is to assure people again that Government will not interfere with their normal and reasonable efforts to make a living; that Government will not take away from them the profit which they make; that reasonable success will receive the recognition it deserves."

International Aspects of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, in the March 12 issue of the County Herald, the journal of the Jefferson County (Ala.) Teachers Association, there was published an article which I prepared for this periodical entitled "International Aspects of Education." With the thought that the article might be of interest to the Members of Congress, I am pleased to insert same herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF EDUCATION

We tend, so very often, to think about education in terms of the local viewpoint only. When education is mentioned our thoughts run straight to underpaid teachers, to crowded classrooms, to inadequate counseling and guidance for students, to the current American debate between the progressive educationists and the neorthodox three R's supporters, and the question of whether Johnny and Janie can read. It is all well and good that we should indeed think first in terms of local education, for it is, obviously, on the local front that our efforts in behalf of better educational systems and methods and facilities have the most effect. Or I should say, it is on the city and county and State educational levels that we can most readily tell whether our efforts are having any effect whatsoever.

In any case, it is natural to consider education to be an immediate and intimate concern. What subject is there that receives more comment in the discussion of local affairs than this? Indeed, all of us talk about education and its needs, many of us worry about the problem, and a lot of us even try to do something about it.

Nevertheless, even if it is well and good and natural to think on education from the standpoint of what it means to Birmingham or Graysville or Shades Mountain, to Jefferson or Lamar or Baldwin Counties, or to the State of Alabama, I think we are detracting from the significance of the word if we do not extend our concept and consideration of education to an international scope.

How trite it must seem to you to read that your Congressman says that "the world is growing smaller each day" and that "today's foreigners are tomorrow's neighbors." And yet, how true. Is there anyone who has failed to be awed by the fact that jet planes and, more frightening, intercontinental ballistic missiles have stretched the meaning of "proximity" to include the entire world; distance is now so relative a term that it is measured in minutes and hours and only very rarely still in miles.

"Fly to Atlanta in 31 minutes," invites a local airline office. By the time most of you straighten up your desks at the end of the day, gather up your papers to grade and that complicated old Register to work on, and finally arrive home, the business executive who left Birmingham by plane at 3 p.m. is halfway to Washington. And on Saturday, if you are able to indulge yourselves and sleep 'til noon, do you realize that the tourist who boarded the jet airliner in New York at 6:30 a.m.—the time you ordinarily have to get up—is now almost able to see the West England shore?

In saying that the world is becoming ever-smaller, we actually should be able to mean that our own private worlds are being enlarged. This brings us rather abruptly to one of the main points I am trying to make: education, as we look at it in and from Alabama, is, like travel, today necessarily considered universal in breadth. What we are doing in our local schools should not be automatically divorced from what the rest of the world is attempting to do in and through its educational institutions.

And yet there arises at this point a rather stinging question. If science and research and advanced knowledge—if education, in its broadest sense—have brought the nations of the world so close together, in the connotation that distance barriers have been broken down, what have science and technical skills and general education done to bring those human beings affected by this collapse of isolating geographical boundaries closer together from a different and more important standpoint?

How ironic it is that in an age when it is proclaimed that the moon is shortly to be visited by man, said man cannot seem to bridge the cultural gap between himself and people of the next hemisphere. How ironic that in an age when the suggestion that we may soon have to deal with Martians is not always made jestingly, Americans cannot not only not deal successfully and peacefully with the Russians who are their earthly enemies, but cannot even understand and deal with their longtime friends and neighbors in Latin America without great difficulty and many unnecessary misunderstandings.

I now proceed to answer part of that stinging question of what is being done in the field of education to narrow the cultural distances that still cause us to be in large measure intellectually confined to our own backyards. I will attempt to give only part of the answer because there is another part, even the most vital part, of the question that you yourselves must provide the answer to, and that is this: whatever we have done and are doing educationally to bring mankind on earth closer together in understanding and mutual appreciation, is it the right thing and have we done enough of it?

Perhaps my giving one answer to the question will enable you to consider more intelligently what your completing answer shall be. It is my hope that this is the case.

What America has done in international education is, quite naturally, largely synonymous with what the U.S. Government has done. By far the largest programs of international educational exchange are supported, totally or in part, by the Federal Govern-

ment. But as these programs are based on the approval and support of the electorate, the Government's efforts in this field can, without stretching the point excessively, be equated with the efforts of the American people.

It was in connection with President Roosevelt's good neighbor policy with Latin America that the U.S. Government made its first significant commitment in the field of international education. A year after the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations had met in Buenos Aires in 1936, the Congress of the United States gave statutory authority for a broad program of exchange of persons between the United States and other American Republics to the end of extending scientific, technical, and general cultural relations with these countries.

The Second World War interrupted continuing development of such programs. It was that war, however, which was surely the most singularly shocking factor in our final realization that international cultural and educational exchanges were vitally necessary if peace was to prevail, however shakily, in the world. Thus it was that at the end of the war the U.S. Congress overwhelmingly approved a measure introduced by Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, to use some of the currencies and credits of other countries acquired by the United States through the sale of surplus property abroad for educational purposes. Two years later, in 1948, the United States Informational and Educational Exchange Act (often called the Smith-Mundt Act) authorized a worldwide program of broad purposes. Its intent was to "enable the Government of the United States to promote a better understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase the mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries," by providing for "an educational service to cooperate with other nations in (a) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills; (b) the rendering of technical and other services; and (c) the interchange of developments in the field of education, the arts, and sciences."

In addition, several other acts of Congress have provided for particular and distinctive educational exchanges with specific countries; such agreements exist with Finland and India, for example.

Aside from the international educational exchange programs which are operated mainly under the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts by the Department of State, there are two other principal programs that relate to higher education. One is the program of educational activities of the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) which includes mainly the technical cooperation program authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The other is the basic program of the U.S. Information Agency (USIA) which is largely educational in nature and includes distinctly educational pursuits and aids.

There are some programs of international exchange on the secondary school level that are partially supported by the Government and I shall shortly deal with them and raise the question of whether they should receive extended support.

To summarize briefly the differences between the main programs related to higher education in general, the primary objective of the Smith-Mundt and the Fulbright programs is to increase international understanding to understanding abroad of the United States, its culture, and its foreign policy. This is done by sending American grantees abroad and bringing foreign nationals to this country, keeping this prime objective in mind. The specific educational or technical activities of the individuals involved in this program are of secondary interest.

In the ICA program, in contrast, the primary objective is to increase some specific technical competence abroad with specific ICA-sponsored projects. For example, prior to the building of a dam in Iran using joint American and Iranian funds, U.S. technicians are selected and sent overseas and/or Iranian engineers are brought to this country with the objective of accomplishing a particular technical-educational aim relative to the project.

The USIA has a multipurposed and broad-ranged field of activity. Through their offices located in principal foreign cities, they disseminate general information about the United States to anyone who requests it. Aside from sponsoring regular programs, such as providing public libraries where foreigners can obtain copies of every important American literary work, the USIA cooperates with American teacher-grantees by providing them background information for lectures, films on various aspects of our country, and such free souvenirs as maps of the United States to be distributed. They are also called upon to provide similar information to such study groups, civic organizations, and particular individuals as request them in those areas where there are offices of the Agency. There is no doubt that the USIA activity of supplying millions of dollars worth of American texts to foreign universities and secondary schools markedly affects instruction in these educational institutions, and this is particularly true in the underdeveloped countries.

Under the Fulbright Act of 1946, particular bilateral arrangements were authorized between the United States and individual nations. Made through the executive branch of the Government, these agreements provide for the exchange of persons for educational purposes. By the present time, 39 countries have concluded agreements with the United States to participate in this program. This program also permits granting of scholarships to foreign nationals to study in American-sponsored schools abroad. In the first year of its implemented existence (1948), the act saw an exchange of some 237 persons. This number has increased steadily, with the increased number of bilateral agreements involved, until by 1957 there were some 6,000 participants in the program that year. About one-third of these were Americans who went abroad to study at the university or graduate level, to teach on secondary or university level, to engage in particular research projects, to act as consultants to foreign governments or organizations, or to lecture before general audiences on topics of current interest. The remaining two-thirds of the participants were foreign nationals who engaged generally in the same type activities in this country.

Under the Smith-Mundt Act, which calls for exchange of persons for the same type purpose but promotes more specifically programs sponsored by academic institutions, libraries, nonprofit organizations, and business and industrial organizations, the number of persons participating each year has also grown to about 6,000 in the past few years. Under both the Smith-Mundt Act and the Fulbright Act, over 50,000 persons have participated in this international educational exchange.

The total cost of the two programs has grown to almost \$25 million per annum, but it is well to remember that this is in large measure provided by what amounts to interest on wartime loans to foreign nations and by the sale of surplus property in foreign countries claimed by the United States as partial payment of debts owed to our Government by those countries.

There are several other programs carried on by the Government that should be mentioned. One of these is the cultural presentations staff, established by Congress in 1954 at the request of the President, which has

undertaken a program to assist cultural and athletic groups with foreign tours. This proved to be such a successful venture that 2 years after the program was set up by Congress on an emergency basis, it was made into a continuing activity by that body in an act approved August 1, 1956. Under the auspices of this program, over 2,500 American artists and athletes have performed in over 90 foreign countries.

This activity, along with special ones like our presentations at the recent World's Fair at Brussels, may not in the strictest sense deal with education. But it does, after all, educate those who view the presentations, of whatever nature, in the ways of American culture and tradition, and does so in a manner that perhaps cannot be equaled in any other way.

One of the most recent developments in the area of educational and cultural exchanges was the recent agreement between our Government and the U.S.S.R. to swap movies, radio, and television broadcasts, and magazines as well as exchange professors and graduate students for a period of 2 years, beginning in January 1958. Other exchanges are to take place between athletic teams and outstanding entertainment groups and artists. The most significant venture on the part of the United States under this agreement is the upcoming merchandise fair our Government is sponsoring in Moscow to show off our outstanding peaceable commodities, commonplace to us but which the average Russian will surely look on in wonder. Who can doubt whether this will make for good propaganda for our Nation in Russia?

In other areas of student exchange outside the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts, the State Department also makes a contribution. Each year for the past several years, the Department has given grants-in-aid to such groups as the American Field Service. This is the largest of 5 privately sponsored organizations that promotes the exchange of students on the high school level. It is this program which perhaps presents the most interesting aspect of international education to you, for foreign exchange students are currently placed in several schools in Birmingham, Jefferson County, and Alabama. Perhaps you know first hand how very much one student from Norway or France or Germany can do to increase your students' interest in that country and to increase even community interest in learning about social and educational practices of foreign countries. Even a spark of such interest, when kindled by an interesting personality in the form of an exchange student, can result in solid friendships and greater mutual appreciation.

And I think I should mention that even a more important result of having exchange students in our high schools is that our young Americans take another look at our own culture and our own institutions in order better to answer the questions put to them by the "foreigner"; they know that for him it is not just an academic question, as is the case when a teacher poses it and already knows the book answer, but an innocent and sincere one that demands a thoughtful reply.

This program of high school student exchanges reached a number of 1,500 participants in 1958. They came from 38 countries. The Government subsidy of this program, in the form of grants-in-aid from the Department of State amounted to \$125,000 in that year, a very small sum compared to the amounts spent in connection with exchanges on the university and higher educational levels. I wonder if it is your experience that this program is sufficiently worthwhile to be enlarged and to receive greater Government support?

To refer again to the program affecting higher education, a recent survey was made by the U.S. Advisory Commission of Educa-

tional Exchange of the views of college presidents whose institutions were involved in student and teacher international exchanges. These men indicated their belief that the program has benefited higher education in several particular ways. One was that the caliber of the foreign scholarship winners to the United States was so superior that it enabled admissions officers to set up proper criteria for admitting other foreign students who wish to study independently. Another was that foreign students make important contributions to academic and community life especially through the interpretation of their cultures to the American people. They further said that presence of foreign students on the campus stimulates among the student body and faculty an increased interest in foreign affairs, and this is particularly true as regards those individuals who do not specialize in foreign languages or international affairs.

That the effect of those who have studied or taught abroad is beneficial to the institution to which an individual returns in the United States is, I think, almost universally true. There can be no question that foreign study is an immense boon to language teachers.

And finally, in most instances, those Americans who go abroad to teach, study, lecture, or engage in research, are generally successful in presenting the American way of life, the American culture, and the American viewpoint.

It will perhaps be of particular interest to you to have the report of a friend of mine recently returned from a year's study in Europe that even regional American cultures and traditions are appreciated by the European student of America. He states that one of the most popular courses taught at the University of Strasbourg, by an American Fulbright professor of English, was on the works of Mark Twain. Thus a greater understanding of America and Americans was gained by analyzing a particular region during a particular period. This should be reassuring to those of us who are concerned lest our friends across the seas think of us in terms of Brooklyn accents and Hollywood riches.

There have, of course, been areas of dissatisfaction with these programs. Foreign students complain sometimes that they have not been able to get the type of education for which they came here. Some have manifested a general inability to adjust appropriately to the American system of education which differs so widely from their own. Likewise, Americans gone abroad to study or teach often find that language barriers and local social customs sometimes make it extremely difficult to become sufficiently acquainted with the local populace to do any educating along the general lines proposed as the main point of the program, that is, the familiarization of foreign friends with the American culture and viewpoint.

One of these difficulties, it might be mentioned here, is the result of our all too meager emphasis on foreign languages in secondary and higher education. It is to be hoped this situation will shortly be ameliorated.

Such then is the general picture of the program of international education currently being carried on by the U.S. Government. It is not by any means the complete picture, but perhaps it will suffice to stir your thoughts and inquiries on the subject. I insist again that it is indeed important that you and I, along with those who are perhaps not so intimately connected with education, do take time to consider the subject from an international viewpoint.

Those who are today's students are tomorrow's teachers of men; and if there is a student or a potential student in any part of the world who is today denied access to the light of truth, it may well be he who helps bring darkness on the world tomorrow.

U.S.S. "Bryce Canyon": U.S. Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most effective instruments for creating goodwill abroad for the United States of America has come to be the officers and men of the U.S. Navy. Wherever they travel the wearers of our naval uniform regard gaining respect and friendship for our country as important a part of the duty to which they have devoted themselves as manning and fighting their ships if ever needs be.

Officers and men of the U.S.S. *Bryce Canyon*, homeported at Long Beach, Calif., and now serving in the Philippines, are typical of Americans in uniform doubling as people-to-people ambassadors of goodwill.

Recently, within little more than a week's period, several fine gestures of friendship to the people of the Philippines were signalled from the *Bryce Canyon*.

The ship established a \$500 scholarship trust fund to provide a young Filipino of Olongapo with a year's instruction at the Feati Institute of Technology in Manila.

In announcing the scholarship, Capt. E. H. Steinmetz, USN, commanding officer of the destroyer tender, said:

Our officers and men raised the funds to provide an opportunity for a particularly deserving young man of Olongapo to further his education in the industrial arts field. The young man to be selected must have a demonstrated aptitude and capability for training in the industrial arts, must be of excellent character and moral integrity, must be financially unable to continue his education without assistance and must not be directly related to any active or retired U.S. Armed Forces personnel.

The *Bryce Canyon* spends most of her time in port at Subic Bay—

Captain Steinmetz explained—

and in appreciation of the very good relations we enjoy with the Philippine citizens of Olongapo we wanted to offer some needy young man with ability the chance to go to college. We wanted to demonstrate our thanks to his townspeople for their many kindnesses to us.

Just a few days earlier 11 officers and men of the *Bryce Canyon* had gone ashore on a mission of mercy. A 38-year-old woman lay dying in the Olongapo Hospital suffering from severe anemia, jaundice, and a severe gall bladder condition. The hospital had no blood bank and only a limited blood supply. The woman required a pint of blood a day if she was to live.

No call went out, no one requested any blood, but the word leaked back to the *Bryce Canyon* that someone needed help. True to their ship's motto, "Always ready," the crewmen literally rushed to the hospital and gave 11 pints of healthy blood.

Grateful for the blood donations, the doctors served, to the surprise and pleasure of the donors, two rounds of local Philippine Island beer stating: "Beer is the best medicine for rebuilding the red blood corpuscles."

The woman's condition is still uncertain, but the Filipino doctors believe she will live, and the men of the *Bryce Canyon* have given their stamp of approval to Filipino blood-building techniques.

This act, in its turn, was preceded only a few days by a visit of several officers and men of the *Bryce Canyon* to a nearby pigmy village to donate over 150 pounds of food to its people.

The pigmies, called Negritos in the Philippines, are a very poor people and make their livelihood selling bows and arrows as souvenirs in the town of Olongapo. In the days of old they were a savage headhunting tribe but civilization has slowly caught up with and passed them. They live in the hills near the Subic Bay Naval Base, in bamboo huts.

Among the food given the pigmies was dry milk. This was the first time the pigmies had seen milk of such a dry consistency but after shown how to mix the milk they expressed their amazement and gratitude for the food.

Meanwhile, being constructed aboard the *Bryce Canyon* is a giant flagpole for the Philippine Boy Scout camp at Manila, which will be the site of the World Boy Scout Jamboree beginning July 17.

These are but examples of the kind spirit of America exhibited by the many ships and many men of the U.S. Navy in many lands throughout the world. To them all, a grateful Nation says, "Well done, U.S. Navy."

State Taxation of Nonresidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 20, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include the following statement which I made before the Senate subcommittee conducting hearings on the problems of State taxation of nonresidents:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RODINO ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 29 AND 67 RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS ON STATE TAXATION OF NONRESIDENTS

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the subcommittee for permitting me to make this statement concerning the problems covered by Senate Joint Resolutions 29 and 67 prohibiting or limiting the States in the taxing of incomes of nonresidents. Being a Representative in Congress from New Jersey, I am intimately and deeply concerned with this taxing problem. My own feeling in the matter results from the present discriminatory practice of New York in its taxation of New Jersey residents.

As you doubtless will recall, the legislature of New Jersey in 1957 adopted a resolu-

tion, Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt a constitutional amendment which would prohibit States from taxing the income of nonresidents. As a result of that petition, I sponsored in the 85th Congress House Joint Resolution 497. Simultaneously 12 bills similar to my own were introduced in Congress, principally from Members representing districts in the States of New Jersey and Connecticut. About a month after the legislature of New Jersey petitioned Congress, the State of Connecticut also petitioned the Congress (S.J. Res. 9) asking that the Congress convene a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution to prohibit States from taxing the income of nonresidents.

At my request, the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary caused a preliminary study to be made of the issues involved in this problem. A memorandum, containing the arguments pro and con, was prepared by one of the counsel of the House Committee on the Judiciary in collaboration with the American Law Section of the Library of Congress, and dated February 13, 1958—a year and 2 months ago—which I wish to submit for the subcommittee's record. (Document attached to end of statement.)

To my mind, the most effective way to deal with this problem of discriminatory taxation is a constitutional amendment eliminating the power. However, such a solution would be most difficult to accomplish since 31 States presently tax the in-State incomes of nonresidents and the membership of Congress from those States would be reluctant to go along with such legislation. In addition, the approach would require a two-thirds vote of each House of Congress and ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. It is unlikely that the taxing States would ratify the proposed change.

Perhaps it is appropriate at this point to mention that the major concern of the 31 taxing States has not been whether nonresidents should be exempted or given equitable tax deductions but rather how best to protect their own residents from double taxation on out-of-State income.

The authority of a State to impose a taxation on income earned within the State by a nonresident was declared over 40 years ago by the decisions in *Shaffer v. Carter* (252 U.S. 37 (1920)) and *Travis v. Yale and Towne Mfg. Co.* (252 U.S. 60 (1920)).

Last year, after the preliminary studies were made, it seemed wiser, in view of the obstacles presented by the Constitutional amendment approach, to intensify efforts at the State level for the negotiation with New York for more equitable tax treatment of New Jersey residents.

Presently, a resident of New York may deduct from gross income such items as municipal taxes on his residence property, sales taxes, mortgage and personal loans, medical expenses within specified limits, premiums on hospitalization insurance, and gifts for charitable, religious and benevolent purposes.

A nonresident on the other hand may deduct from his taxable gross income in New York only an amount equal to 10 percent of such gross income or \$500 whichever is less. While he may itemize his deductions, he may claim only those expenditures incurred in the production of income in New York, and such items as gifts to charitable, religious and benevolent corporations, if organized or operated under the laws of New York.

From an equitable point it seems to many of us that the nonresident taxpayer should be permitted to claim as deductions not only those expenses incurred arising in New York but also, on an apportionment basis, those deductions ordinarily allowed resident taxpayers.

In an effort to broaden deductions conferences were held among Governors Meyner of New Jersey, Harriman of New York, and Ribicoff of Connecticut.

Among other things, a Commission on Out-of-State Taxation of New Jersey Residents was created under Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 (1957) by the New Jersey Legislature. Also, a study was made by Mr. Theodore Tannenwald, Jr. for Governor Harriman of New York in which he recommended enlarging certain deductions for out-of-State residents who must pay New York State taxes on personal income.

As disclosed in the newspapers of recent dates, New York did revise its tax laws but the only gain nonresidents received is a change in the flat sum they may claim in lieu of itemized deductions. Under New York's new law, this is raised from \$500 to \$1,000. The revision will not change the fact that the nonresident will pay considerably more tax than the resident with the same income, despite the fact that the nonresident is ineligible for many of that State's services.

According to latest figures, over 137,000 New Jersey residents working in New York are paying more than \$20 million yearly to New York; Connecticut residents pay over 8 million.

When the 86th Congress convened in January, I reintroduced my bills. They are now designated House Joint Resolution 68 and H.R. 4174. House Joint Resolution 68 calls for a constitutional amendment; H.R. 4174 an interstate compact. To date, five methods have been suggested for dealing with the problem:

1. Constitutional amendment proposed by Congress, prohibiting State taxation of nonresident incomes.

2. Constitutional convention to prohibit State taxation of nonresident incomes.

3. An interstate compact permitting uniform tax treatment of all nonresidents through State agreement.

4. A national or uniform reciprocal law not to discriminate between residents and nonresidents in the levying and collection of taxes.

5. Federal preemption through the interstate commerce clause.

The first method enumerated above is the subject matter of the bills now before the subcommittee.

The State of Connecticut has asked for a constitutional convention under the second method of approach. This ostensibly could take the matter out of the hands of Congress and place it before a convention. However, there has not been a constitutional convention in the 169 years of our existence and, besides, 33 States must ask for it before one is in order.

So far as I know, the interstate compact approach was first suggested on June 3, 1958, at a hearing in Trenton, N.J., before the Commission on Out of State Taxation of New Jersey residents. In substance, the compact would grant the States the power to enter into agreements looking toward uniform tax treatment of nonresidents. It may be argued by some that such an approach is unnecessary since the States now have the power to enter into such agreements. While this is doubtless true, I nonetheless feel that a compact arrangement could have salutary effect because it would permit the States to make binding agreements containing penalty and other provisions. In the event of a breach of the agreement by one of the participating States, remedies, if it were so provided in the agreement, could be brought in our courts.

The fourth suggested approach concerns a national uniform law. As you know, we have many laws which are not Federal laws in the sense that they are enacted by Congress but are nevertheless national in scope in that they can affect all of the several

States. Some of these laws are the Uniform Negotiable Instruments Act, the uniform extradition laws, and the uniform reciprocal enforcement of support laws. These laws come about by the drafting of so-called model acts which contain standard provisions and which are submitted to the States for adoption by the State legislatures and, of course, are binding on all States which adopt them. In the past such laws have been drafted by the Council of State Governments and by the American Law Institute. Certainly, it is within the realm of possibility that these organizations working singly or in conjunction with each other, and with agencies of the Federal Government and/or the Congress, could promulgate a model act for uniform tax treatment of nonresidents with strong enforcement provisions so that the States would be required to give full credence to its provisions.

The fifth suggestion, and one which in my opinion offers the best approach, is a Federal preemption law. Congress has plenary powers over interstate commerce. In some areas it exercises exclusive and absolute control; in others it shares concurrent jurisdiction with the States, and in still other areas it permits the States to occupy the field alone. It is my understanding that Congress under its interstate commerce power could deny to the States the right to tax the incomes of nonresidents where the organizations that employ them are engaged, either in whole or in part, in interstate commerce. It may be that the States should be denied this power of taxation absolutely. It may be that they should be denied it only in certain areas. I feel that this preemption approach merits serious study, looking toward Federal legislation which would restrict the States in this area of taxation so as to guarantee to nonresidents fair and equitable treatment.

As you know, the Supreme Court recently handed down a decision holding, in line with its decision some 40 years earlier, that States may tax the incomes of foreign corporations on activities within the taxing State which are exclusively in furtherance of interstate commerce. (*Northwestern States Portland Cement Co. v. Minnesota*.) I have been advised that the Senate Small Business Committee and the House Committee on the Judiciary, among others, have this decision under study.

Mr. Chairman, this problem is not confined to New York, New Jersey, or Connecticut or to any one region of the United States but is national in scope and effect. It affects all 49 States. It affects not only Minnesota in the northwestern part of our country, but it affects Georgia in the South. In recent months, newspapers have carried accounts of difficulties between Maryland and Virginia; Idaho and North Dakota have a similar problem. Pennsylvania and Delaware, as well as New Jersey and the city of Philadelphia, are also engaged in controversy concerning the taxation of nonresidents.

Mr. Chairman, the unfair and discriminatory actions now being imposed upon some of our citizens simply because their employment requires them to cross State lines must cease. If the States are unwilling to work the problem out at the State level through agreements, compacts, uniform laws, or otherwise, then the Federal Government, through its powers of preemption or by constitutional amendment, should bring about that which the States refuse or are incapable of accomplishing.

ARGUMENTS PRO AND CON ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT STATES FROM LEVYING INCOME TAXES ON NONRESIDENTS (H.J. RES. 497, 85TH CONG.)

PRO

In legal theory the income tax is considered to be a levy against the person, not against property or the process which creates

the income. (Taxes (1955) 33:375.) Being a personal tax it should be levied by the State of residence which provides protection and services to its inhabitants and to their property.

It is incorrect to contend that the nonresident receives the same benefits from the taxing State as do residents thereof. The nonresident does not avail himself of schools, hospitals, and kindred services that are afforded in the taxing State.

To require a nonresident to pay a contribution toward the expenses of a State in which he happens to earn money is to require him to pay something which in public policy and according to right and justice he does not owe.

It is also contrary to the theory of State income tax that a tax should be levied on nonresidents in respect of any income they derive from property owned or business conducted in the State which imposes said tax. The tax is justified as a payment for personal benefits which residents of a State derive from the government under which they are domiciled, and should not apply to nonresidents, who must be presumed to be taxed (and are taxed through various other forms of taxation) for such benefits in the State where they live. Any attempt to impose the tax upon income received by nonresidents from property situated, or business carried on, within the State changes the character of the tax and converts it into a payment, not for personal benefits derived by residents, but for benefits of a totally different nature such as business benefits, etc. These objections are not to be interpreted as meaning that a State cannot levy a tax for such benefits, but merely that it should not do so in the form of a personal income tax.

The contributions and services rendered by a multitude of nonresidents to the general business prosperity and productivity of a State seeking to impose the income tax largely outweigh an expenses of police protection afforded by the latter State.

Only by adoption of a constitutional amendment will it be possible to end once and for all the inequities which result when the taxing State denies to nonresidents the same measure of deductions as it accords to residents. Litigation to remove this inequity having been unsuccessful, the proposed amendment alone can be depended upon to effect a much-needed reform (*Charles Goodwin, Jr. v. New York State Tax Commission* (1955) 146 NYS 2d 172; (1956) 1 N.Y. 2d 680; appeal dismissed (1956) 352 U.S. 805).

Thus a nonresident earning the same salary as a resident is denied the privilege extended to the latter of claiming deductions for sums contributed to his church, for taxes paid on his residence, for medical expenses or for premiums paid for hospitalization insurance, for interest accruing on mortgages or other evidences of indebtedness, or for capital losses incurred. The nonresident cannot take deductions for any of these outlays for the reason that they do not represent expenditures incurred in the taxing State or borne as part of the cost of earning income therein. As a consequence, a nonresident whose only source of income is his salary earned in the taxing State is compelled to pay a higher tax thereon than a resident of said State receiving the same amount of income.

The need for the proposed amendment is not avoided by suggesting that inequities resulting from the taxation of nonresidents can be eliminated by the uniform levy by all States of income taxes applicable to incomes of both nonresidents and residents. States whose citizens are unjustly treated by the tax laws of neighboring States are under no obligation to submit to dictation by the latter and to emulate the latter in the matter of tax legislation. Moreover, discrimination inflicted upon nonresidents by

one State is not to be corrected by the adoption of retaliatory legislation by other States.

Justification of the proposed amendment is not refuted by contending that discriminatory State taxation of the income of nonresidents has been judicially sustained for almost 40 years. The Supreme Court expressed its approval of such practice at a time when State income taxes virtually were a rarity. Upon reconsideration of such discriminatory taxation today, the Court might well be expected to reach a result in harmony with the spirit of the proposed amendment.

By refusing to grant to nonresidents the same measure of deductions which they extend to their own inhabitants the States levying taxes on personal income in effect are erecting discriminatory barriers to the free movement of citizens across State lines which the framers of the Constitution sought to guarantee through the privileges and immunities clause of article 4 of the Constitution. Through discrimination in the measure of deductions, taxing States are making it impossible for out-of-State workers to obtain employment on the same terms of net remuneration as are available to their residents.

CON

Inasmuch as virtually all of the 31 States levying income taxes extend the same to nonresidents, the only beneficiaries of the proposed amendment will be the nonresidents from the minority of States which levy no taxes on personal income. No comparable benefit will accrue to residents of income tax States who work and earn their living in States levying no income tax; for such residents are taxed by the State of their domicile on their entire income from whatever source received.

The proposed amendment is contrary to the spirit of the privileges and immunities clause of article 4 of the Constitution; for it would confer on nonresident employees most of the privileges of residents but exempt them from obligations borne by the latter.

Nonresidents who enjoy the advantages of employment and the receipt of income within a State are morally as well as legally obligated to pay a quid pro quo in the form of a tax on income earned in such State.

In subjecting nonresidents to income taxes the States are applying the same rule as is contained in the Federal income tax law pursuant to which nonresident aliens and foreigners are taxed on income from sources within the United States.

The proposed amendment would adversely affect those States which, by reason of being highly industrialized or constituting financial centers, serve as a source of livelihood for thousands of out-of-State commuters.

Inasmuch as the principal grievance assigned in support of the proposed amendment arises not out of the levy of an income tax on nonresidents but from alleged inequities in the deductions available respectively to residents and nonresidents, it is clear that the remedy sought to be invoked is in excess of that required. Mere amendment of State income tax legislation is primarily needed and this can be achieved through negotiations at the State level, rather than by utilization of the difficult to obtain process of constitutional amendment.

Thus defenses offered in support of this amendment would be eliminated if States taxing the income of nonresidents would permit the latter to claim deductions in the same ratio as their income received in the taxing State bears to their total income received from all sources. Under this statutory change, nonresidents earning their entire income in the taxing State would be eligible to claim all of the deductions hitherto extended only to residents. Moreover, it has been estimated that the States effecting such amendment of their income tax laws would suffer no appreciable loss of revenue.

The taxing States do not levy, as they do in the case of their own residents, on the entire income of nonresidents. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate and equitable for these States to withhold from nonresidents the same measure of deductions as are accorded to residents. The validity of this distinction in the measure of deductions granted has been upheld by the courts (*Chas. Goodwin, Jr. v. New York State Tax Commission* ((1955) 146 N.Y.S. 2d 172; (1956) 1 N.Y. 2d 680; appeals dismissed (1956) 352 U.S. 805)).

If State A imposes no tax on the income of its own residents, why should the latter, who carry on their business or earn their livelihood in State B in competition with citizens of State B, be exempt from taxation

on income by State B? To erect such exemption into a general rule would result not only to the disadvantage of citizens of State B but would encourage every citizen of State B who desired to escape taxes to transfer his legal residence to a country home in State A.

Irrespective of his place of domicile the owner of income-producing property or the recipient of income within a State has the right to call upon the government of that State for protection of his rights. Accordingly, he is under a corresponding obligation to pay taxes, including income taxes, to defray the cost of such protection.

In seeking to recover revenues lost by adoption of the proposed amendment States

might be encouraged to levy novel taxes on business establishments which would have the effect of discouraging them from hiring out-of-State employees.

Of the 31 States levying taxes on personal income all but 2 grant their residents a credit for taxes levied on them as nonresidents by other States. Hence the burden alleged to be produced by multiple taxation is grossly exaggerated.

For almost 40 years collection of State income taxes from nonresidents has been sustained as constitutional (*Travis v. Yale and Towne Mfg. Co.* (1920) 252 U.S. 60)). The proposed amendment thus would overturn a mode of taxation that has met the test of time.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1959

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, with soiled face and hands unclean with the dust of earthly toil, in this moment of communion with the unseen, we would come to the crystal waters of Thy restoring grace.

As those set aside to prescribe for the ills of an ailing social order, we pray that Thou will first cleanse our own souls from moral pollution and mental darkness.

In a world where the worst wars constantly against the best, open our eyes to invisible allies which fight by the side of those who keep step with the drumbeat of Thy will—invincible forces which at last will bend and break the spears of evil.

When the sadness of the world creeps into our own eyes, and we are plagued with our own inadequacy for these violent times which try and test our souls, stand Thou in splendor before us like the light, like love all lovely, like the morning which slays the shadows.

We ask it in the name of that One whose life is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 20, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2100. An act for the relief of John F. Carmody;

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell;

H.R. 4012. An act to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, and for related purposes;

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.R. 2100. An act for the relief of John F. Carmody;

H.R. 3825. An act for the relief of Dr. Gordon D. Hoople, Dr. David W. Brewer, and the estate of the late Dr. Irl H. Blaisdell;

H.R. 4012. An act to provide for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land-grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for related purposes;

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to facilitate the admission into the United States of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) authorizing reprinting of House Document 451 of the 84th Congress was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made," by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 451 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by Honorable EDWIN E. WILLIS; and that there be

printed one hundred and thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of ninety days after which the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Foreign Relations Committee.

The Committee on Finance.

The Business and Commerce Subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The Insurance Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON THE 1958 REVISION OF EAST-WEST TRADE CONTROLS

A letter from the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1958 Revision of East-West Trade Controls (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.